



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,820	12/12/2003	John Charles Calhoun	003797.00692	8835
28319	7590	06/15/2005	EXAMINER	
BANNER & WITCOFF LTD., ATTORNEYS FOR MICROSOFT 1001 G STREET, N.W. ELEVENTH STREET WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4597			BERHANU, SAMUEL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2838	

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/733,820

Applicant(s)

CALHOON ET AL.

Examiner

Samuel Berhanu

Art Unit

2838

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 22-27 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/12/2003.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-21 are, drawn to Group 1, classified in class 320 , subclass 108.
 - II. Claims 22-27, drawn to Group 2, classified in class 702, subclass 63.
2. Inventions II and I are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed since battery packs can be charged by a different system or method. The subcombination has separate utility such as a control and monitoring system.
 1. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
 2. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group II is not required for Group I, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
 3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. During a telephone conversation with Mr. Motley on 4/24/2005 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 26-27 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Objections

7. Applicant is advised that should claim 24 is be found allowable, claim 25 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Double Patenting

8. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

9. Claims 1-21 provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of copending Application No. 10/733850 in view of Stephens (US,5,734,254)
This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Claims 1-25 of Application No. 10/733850 discloses the claimed invention, with the exception of the apparatus being a battery pack. However, Stephens discloses a battery charger assembly in Figure 1, element 10. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to accommodate a battery charger assembly in the power adapter of Application No. 10/733850 as taught by Stephens in order to charge batteries and power electronic devices.

10. Claims 1-21 provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of copending Application No.10/733760. Although the conflicting claims are not identical,

they are not patentably distinct from each other because they disclose a method and system for effective charging and monitoring batteries. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

12. Claim 1, 3-5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stephens (US 5,734,254).

Regarding claim 1, Stephens discloses in Figures 1 and 2 for transmitting inductive energy to a battery charger assembly in proximity thereof, the battery charger assembly (10) including a microprocessor (20) for processing data relevant to the inductive energy, the apparatus comprising: a memory (50) for storing computer readable instructions relevant to providing inductive energy to a battery charger assembly (10); a processor unit operatively coupled to the memory; a transmission element (32,62) operatively coupled to the processor unit so as to provide the inductive energy to the battery charger assembly; and a housing for enclosing the memory and processor unit therein (Column 1, lines 52-56).

Regarding claim 3, Stephens discloses a communications device for receiving and transmitting data (20,50) and the communications device being operatively coupled to the transmission element (24,54)

Regarding claim 4, Stephens discloses an apparatus further comprising an antenna (24,54) and a communications device configured to receive (24,54) the computer readable instructions and configured to transmit (24,54) the instructions to the antenna for wireless data communications to a battery charger assembly (Column 3, lines 41-49).

Regarding claim 5, Stephens discloses a processor unit (50) is configured to receive a plurality of power parameters from the battery pack (Column 3, lines 59-67, column 4, lines 1-6).

Regarding Claim 7, Stephens discloses an apparatus comprising a plurality of transmission elements responsive to receiving a transmission from a battery charging assembly (24, 38, 68, 54,32,62).

13. Claims 8, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Parks et al. (US 5,455,466).

Regarding claim 8, Parks et al disclose in Figures 1 and 2 an apparatus configured for receiving inductive energy, comprising: a memory for storing computer readable data (228) relevant to receiving the inductive energy; a processor unit (228) for processing the computer readable data; a coil configured for receiving inductive energy (200b); a power supply operatively coupled to the processor unit and the coil (Column 3, lines 61-67, Column 4, lines 1-4); the power supply configured to output a direct current

Art Unit: 2838

responsive to the inductive energy (Column 2, lines 43-49) ; and a connector (222) for operatively receiving a portion of a battery pack for logical communications with the processor unit (220,224,226).

Regarding claim 10, Parks et al disclose a communications device (220) operatively coupled to the pickup coil (220).

Regarding claim 11, Parks et al disclose the communications device (220) is configured to receive the computer readable data and transmit the data to the coil (200b).

14. Claims 16, 17, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Garcia et al. (US 5,963,012).

Regarding claim 16, Garcia et al discloses in Figures 2 and 3 a computer implemented method of providing battery assembly, wirelessly receiving a polling message from a source (Column 2, lines 47-59); transmitting a request for power to the source (204); and receiving inductive power from the source (Column 2, lines 30-59).

Regarding claims 17 and 21, Garcia et al. disclose the step of transmitting includes a step of transmitting power parameters to the source (column 2, lines 47-59).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. Claims 2 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephens (US 5,734,254) in view of Stobbe (US 6,275,143).

Regarding claim 2, Stephens discloses the claimed invention, except the apparatus in which the memory includes authentication data for authenticating the battery charger assembly for the inductive energy transmission. However Stobbe discloses the apparatus in which the memory includes authentication data for authenticating the battery charger assembly for the inductive energy transmission (Column 6, lines 5-20). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement authentication data transfer means in Stephens battery pack and charging system as taught by Stobbe in order to protect against unintentional or unwanted battery charging.

Regarding claim 6, Stobbe discloses a processor unit (18) is configured to receive a digital security certificate from a battery charger assembly (Column 6, lines 5-20).

17. Claims 9, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parks et al. (US 5,455,466) in view of Stobbe (US 6,275,143).

Regarding claim 9, Parks et al disclose the claimed invention, except the processor unit is configured to provide authentication data for inductive energy recetiption. However, Stobbe discloses the apparatus in which the processor unit is configured to provide authentication data for inductive energy recetiption (Column 6, lines 5-20). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement authentication data transfer means in Parks et al .

Art Unit: 2838

inductive coupling system as taught by Stobbe in order to protect against unintentional or against unwanted battery charging.

Regarding claim 13, Stobbe discloses the processor unit is configured to provide a digital certificate to a power source (Column 6, lines 5-20).

Regarding claim 15, Stobbe discloses the antenna (52) and a communications device (22,24) configured to receive the computer readable data and configured to transmit the data to the antenna for wireless data communications to a power source (Column 5, lines 35-45).

18. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parks et al. (US 5,455,466) in view of Wendelrup et al. (US 6,291,966).

Regarding claim 12, Parks et al. disclose the claimed invention, except the processor unit is configured to receive a plurality of power parameters from the battery pack; store the power parameters in the memory; and transmit the power requirements to a power source which provides inductive energy. However, Wendelrup et al. disclose in Figures 1 and 2 processor unit (114) is configured to receive a plurality of power parameters from the battery pack (113); store the power parameters in the memory (116); and transmit (117,106) the power requirements to a power source, which provides inductive energy (Column 4, lines 31-52). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Parks et al. inductive coupling system in order to transmit battery parameter to electrical source as taught by Wendelrup et al. to provide effective battery monitoring system.

19. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parks et al. (US 5,455,466) in view of Garcia et al. (5,963,012).

Regarding claim 14, Parks et al. disclose the claimed invention, except the processor unit is configured to draw electrical power from the battery pack; and responsive to receiving an indication of inductive energy at the coil; the processor unit configured to draw electrical power via the coil. However, Garcia et al. disclose in Figure 2 and 3, the processor unit (310) is configured to draw electrical power from the battery pack (304) and responsive to receiving an indication of inductive energy at the coil the processor unit configured to draw electrical power via the coil (208) (column 3, lines 17-52). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Parks et al. inductive coupling system in order to transmit battery parameters to control unit as taught by Garcia et al. so that the device can make any necessary charging adjustments.

20. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia et al. (US 5,963,012) in view of Stobbe (US 6,275,143).

Regarding claim 18, Garcia et al. disclose the claimed limitation, except the step of transmitting includes a step of transmitting authenticating data to the source. However, Stobbe discloses the step of transmitting includes a step of transmitting authenticating data to the source. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement authentication data transfer means in Garcia et al. wireless battery charging system as taught by Stobbe in order to protect against unintentional or unwanted battery charging.

Art Unit: 2838

21. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia et al. (US 5,963,012) in view of Parks et al. (US 5,455,466).

Regarding claim 19, Garcia et al. disclose all the claim limitation, except a step of initiating a step of converting the inductive power to a direct current responsive to the step of receiving. However, Parks et al. disclose in Figure 1 a step of initiating a step of converting the inductive power to a direct current responsive to the step of receiving (Column 2, lines 35-50). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add a charging rectifier circuit in Garcia et al wireless battery charging system as taught by Parks et al. in order to supply direct current appropriate for charging the battery pack.

22. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia et al. (US 5,963,012) in view of Wendelrup et al. (US 6,291,966).

Regarding claim 20, a step of receiving power parameters from battery pack (113) and storing the power parameters in a computer readable memory (116) (Column 4, lines 31-52. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add a computer data storage element as taught by Wendelrup et al. in Garcia et al device in order to monitor battery status.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel Berhanu whose telephone number is 571-272-8430. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Sherry can be reached on 571-272-2084. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SB



MICHAEL SHERRY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800